DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 869 JC 010 036

AUTHOR Baldwin, Anne

TITLE Standards of Academic Progress: Changes in Student Outcomes

since 1994. Information Capsule 99-06C.

INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., FL. Office of Institutional

Research.

PUB DATE 1999-09-00

NOTE 7p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Academic Failure; Academic

Standards; Community Colleges; Educational Trends; *Outcomes

of Education; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *Miami Dade Community College FL

ABSTRACT

The report provides a historical perspective of the Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP) performance and compares changes in fall term 1994 and fall term 1998 at Miami-Dade Community College (Florida). The Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP) monitor student academic performance in order to identify students in need of academic intervention. Two indicators of performance are cumulative grade point average and number of course withdrawals. Students are subject to the Standards once they have attempted at least 7 credits or registered for at least 17 credits. Overall, there was a slight increase in percent of students on the Standards for inadequate performance in 1998, 17.4% compared to 17.1% in 1994. The proportion of students on the Standards has been relatively stable with 17.9% on SOAP in 1991. The increase in students on SOAP is due to proportional rises in the Warning and Probation categories. Campus results show some variation. Medical Center Campus is unique and had a historical low of 6.7% on the Standards in 1998, but is similar to campus and college-wide data for proportion of students in the Warning category. College-wide, White students and Black students show small proportional improvements in 1998 but ethnic group differences are more apparent at the campus level. (JA)







MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE - INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

INFORMATION CAPSULE

I.C. No. 99-06C

September 1999

Summary

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anne Baldwin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Background

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

College-Wide Results

Standards of Academic Progress: Changes in Student Outcomes Since 1994

This capsule provides a historical perspective of the Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP) performance and compares changes in Fall Term 1994 and Fall Term 1998. Overall, there was a slight increase in percent of students on the Standards for inadequate performance in 1998, 17.4% compared to 17.1% in 1994. The proportion of students on the Standards has been relatively stable with 17.9% on SOAP in 1991 (IC No. 94-11C). The increase in students on SOAP is due to proportional rises in the Warning and Probation categories. Campus results show some variation. Medical Center Campus is unique and had a historical low of 6.7% on the Standards in 1998, but is similar to campus and college-wide data for proportion of students in the Warning category. College-wide, White students and Black students show small proportional improvements in 1998 but ethnic group differences are more apparent at the campus level.

The Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP) monitor student academic performance in order to identify students in need of academic intervention. Two indicators of performance are cumulative grade point average (GPA) and number of course withdrawals. GPA is associated with credits attempted and withdrawals are associated with credits registered. Students who have not earned at least a 1.5 cumulative GPA or completed at least 50% of their registered credits are placed on SOAP. Whether a student is placed on Warning, Probation or Suspension depends on the level of inadequacy of academic performance. While on the SOAP, intervention measures applied to students include career counseling, guidance in course selection, and reduction of credit load. Students whose academic performance is satisfactory are placed in the SOAP category called Clear.

Students are subject to the Standards once they have attempted at least 7 credits or registered for at least 17 credits. In Fall Term 1998, 88.7% of students met these criteria and were subject to SOAP standards. These students are referred to as the SOAP "pool" and this overall proportion has remained relatively stable since 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE





Analysis now focuses on the different categories of the Standards. There are three major categories – Warning, Probation, and Suspension – each progressively more severe than the previous. It is possible for an individual to be counted for more than one pool category under certain circumstances. For instance, a student with 29 cumulative credits registered who has withdrawn from most of them may be on Warning for excessive withdrawals. The same student may also have 29 credits attempted with a GPA less than 1.5 and be counted in the Probation category as well.

Warning

Students subject to the Warning status are those with 7.0-16.9 credits attempted or 17.0-29.9 credits registered. "Warning" is the earliest intervention indicator for students whose performance is below par. Students on Warning increased to 21.3% in 1998 compared to 19.7% in 1994. Results by ethnic group show that the percent of Black students on Warning increased from 24.5% in 1994 to 25.6% in 1998. The percent of Hispanic students on Warning also increased from 19.0% in 1994 to 21.3% in 1998. There were 15.8% of White students on Warning in 1998.

Probation

Students subject to the Probation status are those with 17.0- 44.9 credits attempted or 30.0-44.9 credits registered. Students on Probation college-wide increased to 8.0% in 1998 compared to 7.5% in 1994. The percent of Black students on Probation in 1998 was 10.8% and this was the highest proportion of the three ethnic groups. White students had 6.0% of the pool on Probation compared to 7.5% for Hispanics.

Suspension

Students subject to the Suspension status are those with 45+ credits attempted or registered. The proportion of students on Suspension remains unchanged at 2.0% across comparison years. Historically, college-wide proportions on Suspension varied within a narrow span of 2.0%-2.5%. Ethnic changes are tenths of a percent in either direction. White non-Hispanic students and Hispanic students were least likely to be suspended with rates of 1.7% and 1.9%, respectively. For Black non-Hispanic students, the percent on Suspension in 1998 was 2.5%.

Total on Standards

Total on Standards category in the tables include not only the Warning, Probation, and Suspension categories discussed above but also other smaller categories (not separately analyzed) of Dismissal, Suspension Alert, and Extended Probation. Numbers in this group are unduplicated across SOAP categories and percents are calculated for all students with grades, and also for students subject to the standards (e.g. in the SOAP pool). This latter percent (Percent of Subject Students) is an overall indicator of academic performance. College-wide, the 0.3% increase over 1994 puts 17.4% of subject students on the Standards in 1998. Conversely, of all students subject to the standards, 82.6% were in the Clear (satisfactory performance) SOAP category. The percent of Black non-Hispanic and White non-Hispanic students on SOAP decreased slightly from 1994 to 1998 while the percent of Hispanic students on the Standards increased to 17.2% in 1998 from 16.7% in 1994

Campus Results

Data for the campuses generally mirror college-wide results. The percent of students on Warning and Probation, overall, has increased on each campus except Medical Center. The percent of students on Suspension remained unchanged from 1994 to 1998 college-wide, but some variation can be seen in campus data.

North Campus – As a whole, 18.3% of North Campus students subject to the Standards were on SOAP in 1998 compared to 17.6% in 1994. For White non-Hispanic students, the percent on Warning and Probation decreased, resulting in an overall decrease in percent on SOAP in 1998 (14.5%). The slight percentage decrease of Black students on Warning was mostly offset by increases in both Probation and Suspension. The 1998 proportional difference that stands out is the 3.9 percentage point increase for Hispanic students in the warning status (20.6% in 1998 vs. 16.7% in 1994).

Kendall Campus – The proportion of students at Kendall who are on SOAP in Fall Term 1998 exceeded the college-wide, campus, and ethnic proportions for both comparison years and for nearly all categories. Total percent of subject students on SOAP at the Kendall Campus in Fall Term 1998 increased to 19.9% compared to 17.4% college-wide. Black students and White students increased in the Warning and Suspension categories. For Hispanic students, increases occurred in the Warning and Probation categories.

Wolfson Campus – The percent of students who are on SOAP at Wolfson Campus was lower than college-wide proportions for both years shown here and for nearly all ethnic categories. The campus summary demonstrates a small increase to 15.3% of subject students on the Standards in 1998. The 1998 proportion of White students on SOAP at Wolfson, 10.7%, is far lower than the college-wide proportion of 13.5% for this ethnic group. Black proportions increased for all SOAP categories in 1998, particularly for those on Warning, where the proportion increased to 27.7% or 4.3 percentage points. In spite of the increases in proportions of Hispanic students on SOAP across the comparison years in all SOAP categories, the overall proportion of these students on SOAP is still lower by more than two percentage points than the college-wide Hispanic proportions for both 1994 and 1998.

Medical Center Campus – Medical Center Campus results differ from the other campuses. Students on this campus are largely in Limited Access Programs. They have completed their General Education courses, have accumulated more credits, have had more time to solidify their academic performance, and are already career-directed. These conditions account for the dramatic departure from college-wide SOAP proportions. The overall SOAP proportions have dropped from 10.6% in 1994 to a notable 6.7% in 1998 although the percent of students on Warning increased in the same period. Stated another way, 93.3% of Medical Center Campus students subject to the Standards in 1998 were in a Clear SOAP status.

Homestead Campus – Students on the Standards in 1998 increased to 17.3% from 15.7% in 1994. The proportion of Black students on SOAP (25.4%) is higher than for Black students college-wide (21.0%). Lower proportions of White students (12.8%) and Hispanic students (16.0%) were on the Standards in 1998 than in 1994. This latter Hispanic group improved dramatically by 6.6 percentage points.

Brann, H. (1994). Standards of academic progress: Changes in student outcomes since 1991 (Information Capsule No. 94-11C). Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Community College, Office of Institutional Research.

Miami-Dade Community College. <u>Technical manual of procedures</u>. Academic progress categories and credit limitations. Technical No. 408101-408102, revised 10/20/82. Miami, FL: Office of Admissions and Registration.

Anne Baldwin:ab



▲ B99044.DOC

References

Standards of Academic Progress Summary Fall Term 1998 Compared to Fall Term 1994

			Ethnic C	ategory				
	Wh	ite	Bla	ck			Tota	ıl All
	Non-Hispanic		Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Ethnic*	
	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1
_		Co	llege-Wide		•	_		
Students with Grades	9,854	6,250	11,142	10,039	29,538	29,841	51,602	47,085
Subject to Standards**	8,282	5,559	9,579	8,855	26,637	26,464	45,405	41,747
Percent of Total	84.0%	88.9%	86.0%	88.2%	90.2%	88.7%	88.0%	88.7%
Warning Pool	2,307	1,611	2,558	2,266	7,246	7,171	12,353	11,268
On Warning	404	255	627	580	1,376	1,529	2,436	2,404
Percent of Pool	17.5%	15.8%	24.5%	25.6%	19.0%	21.3%	19.7%	21.3%
Probation Pool	6,578	4,402	7,718	7,245	21,332	21,337	36,368	33,684
On Probation	425	265	811	779	1,458	1,599	2,744	2,681
Percent of Pool	6.5%	6.0%	10.5%	10.8%	6.8%	7.5%	7.5%	8.0%
Suspension Pool	5,433	3,584	6,314	5,955	17,554	17,449	29,927	27,586
On Suspension	69	62	149	150	362	338	591	557
Percent of Pool	1.3%	1.7%	2.4%	2.5%	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Total on Standards***	1,206	750	2,026	1,858	4,461	4,544	7,770	7,256
Percent of All Students	12.2%	12.0%	18.2%	18.5%	15.1%	15.2%	15.1%	15.4%
Percent of Subject Students	14.6%	13.5%	21.2%	21.0%	16.7%	17.2%	17.1%	17.4%
		No	rth Campus	3				
Students with Grades	2,355	1,109	6,127	5,633	6,267	6,803	15,056	13,792
Subject to Standards**	1,732	919	5,244	4,930	5,986	5,967	13,211	12,046
Percent of Total	73.5%	82.9%	85.6%	87.5%	95.5%	87.7%	87.7%	87.3%
Warning Pool	513	278	1,370	1,301	1,600	1,633	3,543	3,269
On Warning	113	53	350	329	267	336	737	730
Percent of Pool	22.0%	19.1%	25.5%	25.3%	16.7%	20.6%	20.8%	22.3%
Probation Pool	1,358	726	4,254	4,023	4,829	4,786	10,643	9,721
On Probation	94	44	466	468	300	353	873	875
Percent of Pool	6.9%	6.1%	11.0%	11.6%	6.2%	7.4%	8.2%	9.0%
Suspension Pool	1,118	600	3,502	3,244	3,966	3,933	8,762	7,933
On Suspension	9	14	86	86	77	60	176	161
Percent of Pool	0.8%	2.3%	2.5%	2.7%	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Total on Standards***	265	133	1,159	1,079	871	963	2,326	2,205
Percent of All Students	11.3%	12.0%	18.9%	19.2%	13.9%	14.2%	15.4%	16.0%
Percent of Subject Students	15.3%	14.5%	22.1%	21.9%	14.6%	16.1%	17.6%	18.3%

^{*} Includes remaining ethnic categories, e.g. American Indian, Asian, etc.

Data Source: GRD37 SOAP Report, and SAS Analysis of IRS40 Research Tapes.



^{**} Students with 17 or more credits registered, or 7 or more credits attempted, i.e., the SOAP pool.

^{***} Includes categories not shown -- (Dismissal, Suspension Alert, External Probation), in addition to Warning, Probation, and Suspension.

Standards of Academic Progress Summary Fall Term 1998 Compared to Fall Term 1994

	Ethnic Category							
	White Black					Tota	iA le	
	Non-Hi	spanic	Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Ethnic*	
	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1
		Ken	dall Campu	s				
Students with Grades	4,414	2,857	1,600	1,503	13,351	12,543	19,863	17,364
Subject to Standards**	3,807	2,533	1,331	1,280	11,643	11,088	17,217	15,313
Percent of Total	86.2%	88.7%	83.2%	85.2%	87.2%	88.4%	86.7%	88.2%
Warning Pool	1,033	733	392	357	3,219	2,947	4,769	4,156
On Waming	186	135	92	89	709	659	1,005	901
Percent of Pool	18.0%	18.4%	23.5%	24.9%	22.0%	22.4%	21.1%	21.7%
Probation Pool	3,020	2,006	1,032	1,016	9,202	8,932	13,607	12,275
On Probation	220	146	133	128	769	806	1,152	1,100
Percent of Pool	7.3%	7.3%	12.9%	12.6%	8.4%	9.0%	8.5%	9.0%
Suspension Pool	2,494	1,609	828	824	7,553	7,283	11,171	9,983
On Suspension	53	35	23	24	192	183	274	246
Percent of Pool	2.1%	2.2%	2.8%	2.9%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Total on Standards***	635	424	318	320	2,315	2,246	3,341	3,044
Percent of All Students	14.4%	14.8%	19.9%	21.3%	17.3%	17.9%	16.8%	17.5%
Percent of Subject Students	16.7%	16.7%	23.9%	25.0%	19.9%	20.3%	19.4%	19.9%
		Wolf	son Campu	s				
Students with Grades	1,538	1,272	1,822	1,713	8,086	8,642	11,600	11,751
Subject to Standards**	1,376	1,179	1,614	1,526	7,328	7,693	10,451	10,511
Percent of Total	89.5%	92.7%	88.6%	89.1%	90.6%	89.0%	90.1%	89.4%
Waming Pool	450	431	499	466	2,056	2,301	3,051	3,225
On Waming	56	46	117	129	339	468	513	649
Percent of Pool	12.4%	10.7%	23.4%	27.7%	16.5%	20.3%	16.8%	20.1%
Probation Pool	1,061	858	1,253	1,192	5,883	6,114	8,300	8,255
On Probation	65	46	124	119	333	370	527	538
Percent of Pool	6.1%	5.4%	9.9%	10.0%	5.7%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%
Suspension Pool	838	669	988	965	4,831	4,892	6,737	6,607
On Suspension	5	9	· 21	29	78	81	104	121
Percent of Pool	0.6%	1.3%	2.1%	3.0%	1.6%	1.7%	1.5%	1.8%
Total on Standards***	174	126	333	321	1,040	1,150	1,554	1,606
Percent of All Students	11.3%	9.9%	18.3%	18.7%	12.9%	13.3%	13.4%	13.7%
Percent of Subject Students	12.6%	10.7%	20.6%	21.0%	14.2%	14.9%	14.9%	15.3%

^{*} Includes remaining ethnic categories, e.g. American Indian, Asian, etc.



^{**} Students with 17 or more credits registered, or 7 or more credits attempted, i.e., the SOAP pool.

Includes categories not shown — (Dismissal, Suspension Alert, External Probation), in addition to Warning, Probation, and Suspension.

Data Source: GRD37 SOAP Report, and SAS Analysis of IRS40 Research Tapes.

Standards of Academic Progress Summary Fall Term 1998 Compared to Fall Term 1994

Ethnic Category								
	White Black				Total All			
	Non-His	spanic			Hispanic		Ethnic*	
	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1	94-1	98-1
		Medical	Center Car	npus				
Students with Grades	861	495	1,312	822	1,191	1,224	3,434	2,611
Subject to Standards**	803	489	1,177	800	1,144	1,184	3,184	2,538
Percent of Total	93.3%	98.8%	89.7%	97.3%	96.1%	96.7%	92.7%	97.2%
Warning Pool	147	33	231	46	204	115	586	200
On Warning	19	1	52	10	32	30	104	41
Percent of Pool	12.9%	3.0%	22.5%	21.7%	15.7%	26.1%	17.7%	20.5%
Probation Pool	706	466	1,012	763	992	1,101	2,766	2,391
On Probation	21	7	70	32	33	44	126	85
Percent of Pool	3.0%	1.5%	6.9%	4.2%	3.3%	4.0%	4.6%	3.6%
Suspension Pool	626	439	862	737	880	1,027	2,424	2,262
On Suspension	1	0	12	2	8	9	22	11
Percent of Pool	0.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%
Total on Standards***	56	11	161	57	114	100	338	170
Percent of All Students	6.5%	2.2%	12.3%	6.9%	9.6%	8.2%	9.8%	6.5%
Percent of Subject Students	7.0%	2.2%	13.7%	7.1%	10.0%	8.4%	10.6%	6.7%
		Home	stead Camp	ous				
Students with Grades	686	517	281	368	643	629	1,649	1,567
Subject to Standards**	564	439	213	319	536	532	1,342	1,339
Percent of Total	82.2%	84.9%	75.8%	86.7%	83.4%	84.6%	81.4%	85.4%
Warning Pool	164	136	66	96	167	175	404	418
On Warning	30	20	16	23	29	36	77	83
Percent of Pool	18.3%	14.7%	24.2%	24.0%	17.4%	20.6%	19.1%	19.9%
Probation Pool	433	346	167	251	426	404	1,052	1,042
On Probation	25	22	18	32	23	26	66	83
Percent of Pool	5.8%	6.4%	10.8%	12.7%	5.4%	6.4%	6.3%	8.0%
Suspension Pool	357	267	134	185	324	314	833	801
On Suspension	1	4	7	9	7	5	15	18
Percent of Pool	0.3%	1.5%	5.2%	4.9%	2.2%	1.6%	1.8%	2.2%
Total on Standards***	76	56	55	81	121	85	211	231
Percent of All Students	11.1%	10.8%	19.6%	22.0%	18.8%	13.5%	12.8%	14.7%
Percent of Subject Students	13.5%	12.8%	25.8%	25.4%	22.6%	16.0%	15.7%	17.3%

^{*} Includes remaining ethnic categories, e.g. American Indian, Asian, etc.



^{**} Students with 17 or more credits registered, or 7 or more credits attempted, i.e., the SOAP pool.

^{***} Includes categories not shown -- (Dismissal, Suspension Alert, External Probation), in addition to Warning, Probation, and Suspension.

Data Source: GRD37 SOAP Report, and SAS Analysis of IRS40 Research Tapes.



U.S. Department of Education

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

ı	DOCI	IMENT	IDENTI	FIC.A	TION
		31A1E-14 1	IULITI		LIIVIT.

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:									
Title: Standards of Academic Progress: Chan	9: Standards of Academic Progress: Changes in Student Outcomes Since 1994								
Information Capsule # 99-06C									
Author(s): Anne Baldwin									
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:								
	September 1999								
in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Edu paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is g	Int materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced location (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document. The sample sticker shown below will be								
affixed to all Level 1 documents	affixed to all Level 2 documents								

Check here For Level 1 Release:

Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND **DISSEMINATE THIS** MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Check here For Level 2 Release:

Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but not in paper copy.

Level 1

Level 2

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

Sign here→ please

Signature:

Organization/Address

Institutional Research Miami-Dade Community College 300 N.E. 2nd Ave, Room 5601 Miami, FL 33132-2297

Printed Name/Position/Title:

Anne Baldwin

Senior Research Associate FAX:

Telephone: (305) 237-7475

(305) 237-7496

E-Mail Address:

abaldwin@mdcc.edu

11/28/00

Date:



III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor	·•				
Address:	***************************************		***************************************		
Price:	***	······································		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	AL OF ERIC TO				
Name:			·		
Address:					**************************************
		-		,	
\\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	TO CEND THIS P	-ODM:			

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

TAMARA HOLUB

Acquisitions Analyst

University of California, Los Angeles ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges

3051 Moore Hall

Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

